

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Preliminarily, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 5-6 and 25. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 6, 23, and 36 have been cancelled. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-16, 18-19, 21, 24-29, and 53-55 have been amended. Claim 59 has been added. Claims 5 and 25 have been rewritten in independent form. Support for the amendments and the new claim may be found throughout the specification, for example, in the originally filed claims.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 2-5, 7-22, 24-35, and 37-59, as amended, will be pending. Claims 5, 21, 25, 30, and 33 are independent.

The Examiner has objected to claims 5 and 25 as being allowable, but dependent on a rejected base claim. These claims have been rewritten in independent form and are believed to be allowable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection and an indication of allowance of claims 5 and 25 and their dependents.

Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 16 has been amended to overcome the rejection and is believed to be in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-20, 23 and 26-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,136,880 to Snowwhite *et al.* ("Snowwhite 1"). Claims 1-4, 8-9, 12-16, 19-20, 23-24 and 26-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,359,025 to Snowwhite *et al.* ("Snowwhite 2"). Claims 1, 3-4, 8-9, 13-20, 23, 26-28 and 30-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,034 to Yamazaki *et al.* ("Yamazaki"). Claims 1, 3, 8, 10-20 and 30-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,782,129 to Moschovis *et al.* ("Moschovis").

Applicants respectfully submit that, although the cited references generally mention the possibility of using a combination of photoinitiators, none of the cited references teaches or suggests that the combinations of the photoinitiators have the particular properties of the present invention. For example, none of the references includes at least two free radical photoinitiators having the overall absorption

spectrum as indicated in independent claim 30. Similarly, none of the references teaches or suggests a radiation-curable composition including at least three free radical photoinitiators having the absorption spectra as indicated in independent claim 33.

Finally, as presented in Applicants' previous Reply and as recognized by the Examiner in the instant Office Action at page 3, paragraph 4, the present invention includes unexpected results of faster cure speed using multi-photoinitiators when compared to an equal or greater amount of one photoinitiator in substantially identical compositions (see Excerpts from tables 7 and 8 of the present application below). The cited references do not teach or suggest these unexpected results and therefore claims 30, 33 and their dependents are patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Table 7 (Excerpt)

Components	Comp. Ex. D	Ex. 10
Oligomer 7 (wt. %)	56.00	56.00
Propoxylated nonyl phenol acrylate (wt. %)	36.50	38.00
Irgacure 184 (wt. %)	6.00	2.00
Irgacure 1700 (wt.%)	--	--
Lucirin TPO (wt. %)	--	0.50
Darocur 1173 (wt. %)	--	2.00
Irganox 1035 (wt. %)	1.00	1.00
A-189 (wt. %)	0.49	0.49
A-1110 (wt. %)	0.01	0.01
% RAU (4.4 mJ/cm <sup>2</sup> )	58.3	67.9

Table 8 (Excerpt)

Components	Comp. Ex. E	Ex. 12
Oligomer 8	35.00	35.00
Oligomer 9	35.00	35.00
Hexane diol diacrylate (wt. %)	24.995	25.995
Irgacure 184 (wt.%)	4.00	1.00
Lucirin TPO (wt. %)	--	0.70
Irgacure 819 (wt. %)	--	0.3
Darocur 1173 (wt. %)	--	1.00
Irganox 1035 (wt. %)	1.00	1.00
DC 57 (wt. %)	0.005	0.005
% RAU (4.4 mJ/cm <sup>2</sup> )	50.9	66.8

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By:



John E. Mauk  
Registration No. 54,579  
Direct No. (202) 263-3255

Paul L. Sharer  
Registration No. 36,004  
Direct No. (202) 263-3340

PLS/JEM  
Intellectual Property Group  
1909 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101  
(202) 263-3000 Telephone  
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: September 30, 2005